

Equity Steering Committee Meeting
February 8th, 2017
Meeting Notes

The meeting of the Steering Committee began at 4:05 pm in the 3rd floor conference room in the Townsend building in Dover. Angeline opened the meeting with a welcome followed by self-introductions of each attendee. Meeting was then relocated to the Cabinet room of the Townsend building.

Objectives of today's meeting are:

1. Refresher of the Excellent Educator for All Plan
2. ESSA reporting requirements on educator equity Gaps
3. Statewide Goal setting
4. Feedback

UPDATES FROM ANGELINE RIVELLO

Angeline gave a brief overview of the Excellent Educator for All Plan and reported that studies continue to show that equity Gaps continue to endure for students of low income and minority backgrounds. All districts and charter schools will be receiving updated data on March 15, 2017. The Steering Committee will be working on plan to roll out the data to the public.

ESSA Reporting Requirements

Angeline reviewed ESSA and the indicators required to be reported:

- Inexperienced educator (less than 4 Years of experience)
- Ineffective educators (as measured by Component V/Student Growth Component ratings)
- Out of field educators
 - a. Courses taught without relevant certification (all)
 - b. Courses taught by teachers w/out relevant certification (previous HQT subject teachers)
- All measured at student level

BM presented this part but ESSA regulations what we measure:

Title I Schools	VS	Non-Title I schools
Low income students		non-low income students
Students of Color		White Students

****These areas will be further broken down into High Needs schools vs. Non High Needs schools**

Brittany reviewed the definition of "high needs schools".

Brittany reviewed the parameters that are used in data reporting as mandated by federal law and how it was captured. Also reviewed what the ESSA indicators are and how they were applied to evaluating educators and schools.

In an attempt to get more feedback from attendees, Brittany had all attendees break into small groups to discuss and fill out a form with which they had to make an educated guess of the percentages our State is currently hitting at identifying our high needs schools, both public and charter. Brittany then revealed the data results for the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years for comparison to their perceptions.

FEEDBACK

- Concerns were expressed on how the data is presented to the public with regards to the form used; felt the GAP data was more likely to be misinterpreted by the public, and the Committee recommended adding a language and odds examples to clarify the Gaps.
 - The group also suggested a walk-through example, in addition to a benchmark. For the benchmark, they suggested a statewide average for comparison to the reference groups.
- Can the other side of the curve be reported as well? i.e. the amount of highly experienced teachers to give more perspective to the data regarding inexperienced educators.
- Concerns with labeling teachers as “inexperienced”
- How are we going to handle the recourse from publishing these numbers?
- The group suggested we adhere to state code/definitions, as opposed to language stemming from ESSA. There was concern that the new federal administration could pivot away from ESSA, and in turn render the work done thus far null and void.
- Another possible indicator could be the cumulative number of courses that students take from out-of-field, inexperienced instructors, etc. over an academic career. This was an attempt to rely on what could be a more robust measure.
- There were questions around the purpose of the figures presented. It was reiterated by members of the team that the aim was not to critique the measures, but to work collectively toward redressing Gaps between low-income students/students of color, and affluent students. Ultimately, there seemed to be consensus around increasing access, since the data illustrated that in each of the measures there were access Gaps delineated by race & socioeconomic status.
- Instead of using the component V rating as the measure for ineffective teachers, we could potentially use only measure A within component V. This was suggested to get a more robust/less watered down measure of student growth.
- There was talk of tweaking the way we define core academic areas for HQT reporting. Namely, accounting for areas which perhaps should be covered, but are not.

OUTLOOK

Angeline would like all the school districts to identify their own gaps for inexperience/experienced educators. She will also put some language together for interpreting the data and send out for review and feedback.

SUMMARY

In summary, the overall goal is to focus our efforts in identifying, communicating, and closing the equity Gaps among our students at state, district, and school levels. Closing the GAPS will then lead to achieving state goals. After Brittany walked participants through the data points, individuals were asked to provide written feedback, which included (1) key takeaways from the data, (2) recommendations for ESSA goal-setting-process, and (3) a vote on which subject areas should be used for the state's out of field measures. This information will be considered when determining final educator equity goals for ESSA.

ATTENDANCE FOR THIS MEETING – 15 total attendees (1 via go to meeting)

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of this committee was not determined at this time.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:45pm.

Respectfully,

Mary Pardee
Department of Education